DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 434 CE 007 172

TITLE	Cooperative Day of Planning VIII: A Report on the Eighth Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (Hot Springs, Arkansas, April 5-6, 1973).
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	6 Apr 73
NOTE	52p.; For related documents, see CE 007 171-175; Photographs will not reproduce in microfiche
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; Career Education; *Conference Reports; *Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; Educational Planning; Educational Problems; National Organizations; Speeches; State Agencies; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	NACVE; National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education; SACVE; State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

A summary of the proceedings of the eighth joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, held in 1973, is presented. The meeting was attended by State, territorial, and National Council representatives. The agenda and highlights of the meeting are included as well as the two resolutions formulated in the meeting. Small group discussion reports focus on the following subjects: (1) the role of vocational education in career education, (2) the role of State and National Advisory Councils unde revenue sharing, (3) the relationship of State Advisory Councils to other State agencies, (4) an outline for the 1973 State Advisory Council evaluations, (5) maintaining the independence of State Advisory Councils, and (6) planning and budgeting for vocational education. The texts of speeches by James A. Rhodes, Erick Lindman, Daniel Woods, and Lloyd Needs are provided. The speeches covered topics related to the development, administration, implementation, and funding of vocational education programs. (EC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123434

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING VIII

A Report on the Eighth Joint Meeting
of the State and National Advisory Councils
on Vocational Education

April 5-6, 1973
Hot Springs, Arkansas

CE007172

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 5

Agenda 7

Highlights of the Meeting 13

Resolutions 17

Small Group Discussion Reports 21

The Role of Vocational Education in Career Education 21

The Role of State and National Advisory Councils under Revenue Sharing 24

The Relationship of State Advisory Councils to Other State Agencies 25

An Outline for the 1973 State Advisory Council Evaluations 27

Maintaining the Independence of State Advisory Councils 31

Planning and Budgeting for Vocational Education 33

Presentations 35

James Rhodes, Chairman, National Advisory Council 37

Erick Lindman, UCLA 43

Daniel Woods, Timex Corporation 46

Lloyd Meeds, Member of U.S. Congress 53

INTRODUCTION

The State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, created by Congress in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, were designed as independent boards to evaluate and recommend changes in the planning and operation of vocational education. At the time of their creation, the State and National Advisory Councils agreed that it would be mutually beneficial to meet semi-annually to discuss major issues and exchange information and ideas. The first joint meeting was held in November 1969. Subsequent meetings have been held in May 1970, November 1970, April 1971, November 1971, May 1972, and November 1972.

The Eighth Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education was held April 5-6, 1973, in Hot Springs, Arkansas. Attending the meeting were representatives of every State and Territorial Council and the National Council.

As State Councils have continued to progress, as they have become more sophisticated in their evaluation reports and dynamic in affecting the course of vocational education within their states, these meetings have proved most valuable. Council members not only have the opportunity to view developments in vocational education from a national perspective but also to discuss the work of Advisory Councils with their peers from other states.

We hope that this written record of the meeting will prove useful to State Council members and others interested in the concerns and activities of State Councils.

Calvin Dellefield
Executive Director
National Advisory Council

AGENDA

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING VIII
A Joint Meeting of the National and State
Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

AGENDA

Thursday, April 5, 1973:

Conference Center Rooms B and C

9:00am Greetings . . . . . Don Cargill, Chairman
Ad Hoc Planning Committee

Welcome . . . . . James A. Dildy, Chairman
Arkansas Advisory Council

Opening Remarks . . . James A. Rhodes, Chairman
National Advisory Council

9:30am Report from the National Council:

Introduction . . . . . .Calvin Dellefield

Intergovernmental Agencies
Committee . . . . . .Duane Lund

Indian Education Committee . .Caroline Hughes

Project Baseline . . . . . .Arthur Lee

Committee on Industry-
Education Relations . . . . . .Holly Coors

Public Information and
Student Organizations . . . . .Martha Bachman

Legislative Report . . . . . Donald McDowell

Budget Report . . . . . David Van Alstyne

10:00am Report: The Actual Costs of Vocational Education Programs:

Introduction . . . . . Dr. Melvin Barlow
California SACVE

Report . . . . . Dr. Erick Lindman, UCLA
and Dr. Daniel Aldrich

10:30am Coffee Break

11:15pm Office of Education Report: . . .Dr. William Pierce
Revenue Sharing; Deputy Commissioner
Education Amendments for Occupational and
of 1972; Adult Education
Bureau Structure

12:00 Luncheon:

Introduction . . . . . .Lanny Hassell
Executive Director
Arkansas SACVE

The Role of State Advisory
Councils in Industry-Education
Cooperation . . . . . Mr. Daniel Woods
Industrial Relations Manager
Timex Corporation

1:30pm Discussion Groups—Tower Suites

A. The Role of Vocational Education in Career Education

B. The Role of State and National Advisory Councils under Revenue Sharing

C. The Relationship of State Advisory Councils to Other State Agencies

D. Preparation of an Outline for the 1973 State Advisory Council Evaluation Reports

E. Maintaining the Independence of State Advisory Councils

F. Planning and Budgeting for Vocational Education: An In-Depth Discussion with Drs. Lindman and Aldrich

5:30pm Reception hosted by the Arkansas Advisory Council

Friday, April 6, 1973

Conference Center Rooms B and C

9:00am Call to Order . . . . . Don Cargill, Chairman
Ad Hoc Planning Committee

9:10am Report of Discussion Groups

10:45am Iowa Career Education Films . . . . Harlan Giese
Executive Director
Iowa Council

11:00am Presentation by Vocational Student Organizations

Future Farmers of America

Future Business Leaders of America

Office Education Association

Vocational Industrial Clubs of America

Distributive Education Club of America

Future Homemakers of America

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MEETING

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MEETING

The Eighth Cooperative Day of Planning, hosted by the Arkansas Council, was held in Hot Springs, Arkansas on April 5th and 6th. Don Cargill, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Planning Committee, opened the meeting at 9:00am and the group was officially welcomed by Arkansas Council Chairman James Dildy.

William Pierce swears in John Bustamante

Don Cargill

The opening address, delivered by National Council Chairman James A. Rhodes, was a rousing one (see text on page 37). Governor Rhodes challenged the nation's educational system to meet the real needs of its young people. Many of today's "drop-outs," he maintained, could more accurately be called "push-outs" or "pitch-outs." As a partial solution he advocated strengthening vocational education by placing all manpower and occupationally-related programs under a separate federal board.

OE's Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education, William Pierce, administered the oath of office to new National Council members John Thiele, Arthur Lee, John Bustamante, and reappointed members Thomas

National Council member Martha Bachman gives report on Public Information and Indian Affairs Committee above. Below are members of State and National Councils at luncheon.

Pauken and Donald McDowell. James Rhodes was sworn in as Chairman and Lowell Burkett as Vice-Chairman.

Next came the National Council's report, consisting of seven subcommittee reports by Duane Lund, Caroline Hughes, Arthur Lee, Holly Coors, Martha Bachman, Donald McDowell, and David Van Alstyne.

Dr. Erick Lindman of Los Angeles reported on his study, "Financial Support for Vocational Education in the Public Schools (see p. 43). Dr. William Pierce then reported on the Better Schools Act of 1973 (the Administration's proposal for education revenue sharing).

Luncheon featured guest speaker Dan Woods of the Timex Corporation (see p. 46), who spoke on industry-education cooperation. Mr. Woods emphasized the need for a broadly-based educational system capable of fulfilling the requirements of all peoples; such a system, he said, would also best serve the needs of industry.

After lunch, six key issues dealing with vocational education and the role of the Advisory Councils were explored in small group discussions. The reports from these groups begin on page 21.

The last speaker of the day was Congressman Lloyd Meeds (D, Wash.), who affirmed the importance of vocational education and complemented the Advisory Councils on their work. He referred to the

Administration's education revenue sharing proposal as "a clear and present danger to all we have been trying to build for young people in this country" (see p. 53).

Reports from the discussion groups were the first order of business the following day. A resolution calling for a continued federal mandate for independent State and National Advisory Councils was proposed by the group discussing "The Role of State and National Advisory Councils under Revenue Sharing." Also adopted was a resolution of the Arkansas Council's requesting full implementation of PL-90-576 and Title X of PL 92-318 (see p. 17).

A change of pace was provided by several short films on career education. These films, made for TV, were created with the help of the Iowa Council and the National Council's Public Information Project. They were followed by a film on the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America. A brief description of the goals and activities of DECA, FBLA, FFA, FHA, OEA and VICA was then given by student representatives of these organizations.

The meeting turned to selection of a chairman for the November CDP Ad Hoc Planning Committee. The group unanimously elected Robert White, Executive Director of South Carolina. Thanks were extended to the planners of this meeting—Don Cargill of the Georgia Council and Lanny Hassel and Frank Troutman of Arkansas.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45am.

A small discussion group in progress (above). Pictured below are representatives of student organizations. James Rhodes greets Mississippi Council member Frank Oakes at right.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution Calling for Federal Support of
State and National Advisory Councils

WHEREAS: Prior to 1968 the vocational education delivery system was not meeting the occupational and training needs of our youth and adults.

WHEREAS: The SACVEs and NACVE under the Vocational Education Act of 1968 were charged with the critical responsibility of assuring that vocational education delivery systems would meet the occupational and training needs of our youth and adults.

WHEREAS: The lay citizens in the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education had demonstrated their ability to effect positive change through active involvement in the planning and evaluations of vocational educational programs, services and activities.

WHEREAS: At this critical time the nation is at the threshold of providing equal educational opportunities for all citizens through vocational education.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That any and all federal legislation or policy to be implemented must provide for the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education to continue their independent audit function and advisory role on behalf of the youth and adults of this nation.

Adopted April 6, 1973

Resolution on Implementation of
PL 90-756 and Title X of PL 92-318

WHEREAS: The growth and development of vocational education during the past half century has contributed to the economic self-sufficiency of millions of people and has given this nation the greatest productive system known to man.

WHEREAS: Advances in technology have increased the need for more vocational-technical and occupational education and have identified new areas not accommodated by vocational education. These changing requirements have brought about an increasing variety of needs. This had led to a duplication of effort, waste, inefficiency, and confusion with resulting social and economic damage to this nation.

WHEREAS: Given limited financial resources and faced with the enormous task of coordinating and providing for our nation's human resource development...

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY VOTE OF THE NATIONAL AND STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS DULY ASSEMBLED AT THIS JOINT CONFERENCE:

That the United States Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are urged to fully support with adequate funding and equal effort the programs authorized in Public Law 90-576 and Public Law 92-318, Title X.

Adopted April 6, 1973

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION REPORTS

THE ROLE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CAREER EDUCATION

Chairman: Harlan Giese

Major points discussed:

Twenty-two persons representing numerous State Advisory Councils agreed that:

1) Career education is a vehicle designed to give every youngster the decision-making ability to make an honest career choice based on personal talent awareness and a broad awareness of the world of work, that will provide a solid foundation of intellectual and occupational skills to enable the individual to make informed career and educational choices on a continuing basis throughout life. Career education is all education, emphasizing learning to live, learning to learn, and learning to earn. State boards should use their regulatory and fiscal powers to mandate implementation of career education for all students immediately.

2) The role of vocational education in the above concept must be:

   a) To be the bridge between the schools and the employing community.

   b) To provide consultant services to other educators to help implement the occupational awareness and exploratory programs which are essential.

   c) To provide skill preparation for employment related to regional labor market needs and projections.

THE ROLE OF STATE AND NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS UNDER REVENUE SHARING

Chairman: Richard J. Collins

Major points discussed:

Group sought action orientation in two directions:

1) What Councils can do to convince the national administration and Congress to continue Advisory Councils.

2) What Councils can do at the state level should revenue sharing come about without provisions for continuation of Councils.

Recommendations:

1) National level

   a) Contact and inform Congressmen on Council activities and implications of revenue sharing.

   b) Seek permanent (legal) establishment by state legislation or executive order of governor.

   c) Establish Council as a research and evaluative arm of the legislature.

   d) Designate an existing statutory state advisory body to carry out functions of the Council.

   e) Seek industry or other organizational support.

3) Resolution adopted by Committee—recommendation to the body that it be adopted and sent to the White House and Congress.

(For text of resolution, see page 19.)

THE RELATIONSHIP OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS TO OTHER STATE AGENCIES

Chairman: Alton Ice

Major points discussed:

1) SACVEs can serve a catalytic function in encouraging inter-agency relationships.

2) SACVEs can provide visibility for programs that other agencies might constrain.

3) SACVEs can focus the attention of the public upon the needs of people and encourage resources to respond to these needs.

4) SACVEs gain acceptance of their findings and recommendations through (a) analysis of data, (b) research, (c) newsletters, news releases and other communications, (d) hearings, forums and other public exposure, (e) studies, etc.

5) SACVEs can encourage relationships with agencies through information systems, product evaluations, etc.

6) SACVEs can serve as "weather vanes" for State Boards of Education and other agencies.

7) SACVEs should be a resource of information and guidance for legislative and other policy development bodies.

8) SACVEs should work with interested organizations and groups and have a good rapport with the media.

9) SACVEs should work closely with other planning groups such as CAMPS, etc.

10) The following agencies were identified as those having particular relevance to SACVEs:

a) Employment services

b) State Board of Education and staff

c) State Board of Regents and staff

d) State education associations

e) State trade and professional organizations

f) Industrial and economic development

g) Rehabilitation services

h) Department of Welfare

i) Mental Health and Retardation Department

j) Department of Health

k) Licensing and examining boards

l) Proprietary school commissions

m) Similar human resources

11) The group saw very little relationship between SACVEs and federal agencies other than through NACVE and USOE.

AN OUTLINE FOR
THE 1973 STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL EVALUATIONS

Chairman: Joe Clary

Major points discussed:

1) What information is most useful?

   a) Reflection of needs

   b) Available programs

   c) Reflection of where we are, where we are going, and how we can get there

   d) How goals are established in the state plan

   e) Discussion of process by which state arrives at goals

2) What additional data are needed or helpful in forming recommendations?

   a) Reliable manpower need projections—specifically emerging occupations

   b) Policies and philosophies of Advisory Councils

   c) Available data in state departments so that gathering is not duplicated

   d) Data from unemployment service are not available. (Source: Employment Security Commission, RCU, contracts, State Departments, private schools, where such are licensed)

   e) A full-time statistician to see that data sources are not duplicated

f) Evaluation reports, per se, are merely another compliance document

g) Should the Council validate existing data or use external means of securing it?

h) How are the needs of students and industries met in the plan?

i) State reports should supplement own data after the guidelines are met

j) Some sub-questions under goals are repetitive and are not applicable to all states

k) Industries' needs, in addition to people's needs, should be included

3) What format is most needed (useful)?

a) Should reports have a commonality?

b) Give USOE and NACVE the information they need first

c) Do not repeat same type of information year after year

4) What information from other states do Councils need?

—Good ideas from other states' reports

5) What aspects of reports should be common to all states?

a) Reports still seem to be cluttered with extraneous matter

b) Reports should be short, with longer or more detailed ones available upon request

c) What is specific purpose of your report and what is your public?

d) Answers to goals 1 and 2

e) States should meet deadline on submission of reports. Time extension was requested last year from October 1 to December 1, but by January 1 only 21 had been received.

f) Recommendations should not be too verbose or too numerous. They should be listed in order of priority.

6) What type of analysis do we want from the National level?

a) Feedback on anything NACVE has done

b) Summary of various state recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS:

We recognize the purpose of jointly developed guidelines for annual evaluation reports to serve commonality in the reporting. With this in mind, we recommend the following:

To the Joint NACVE/SACVE Session:

1) Retain the three basic goals of previous guidelines.

2) Revise current guidelines to reduce redundancies in the subquestions under the goals.

3) Have an ad hoc committee from State Councils, the National Council and USOE to revise guidelines for the report (to implement recommendation 2) to be coordinated by NACVE/SACVE cooperatively, with suggested date for this action to come not later than May 30, 1973.

To the National Advisory Council:

1) The National Council should summarize recommendations in annual reports and distribute the summary to the State Councils.

To the State Councils:

1) Share reports with each other.

2) Identify our publics and develop additional evaluations, above those required in the minimal guidelines, for the different publics.

3) Emphasize meeting December 1 deadline on report submission.

MAINTAINING THE INDEPENDENCE OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

Chairman: William E. Nagel

Major points discussed:

The only premise upon which State Councils can be based is upon their independence. The following are suggestions for maintaining it. It should be stated, however, that they are not listed according to any system of priority.

1) Develop alternate bases for funding, such as state revenue, organizations, foundations or institutions, and business, labor or industry.

2) Advise governor or State Board of Education on membership qualities—not persons.

3) Structure on actual "power base" by credibility, honesty, and production—not by an "implied base" built upon federal law or rules and regulations. Clout must be earned, not mandated.

4) Build on the rationale that the problems of education must not be only the responsibility of education, but a part of a cultural, social and economic change in the whole system, i.e., behavioral change.

5) Each Council should evaluate itself every year to establish or re-order priorities based upon the previous year's accomplishments or lack of same.

6) "Line up" the people with strong interest and motivation who believe in State Councils, i.e., business, labor, industry, government or legislature.

7) Develop a publicity or PR effort to explain or improve programs, activities or services for needs of people through radio,

TV, newspapers, magazines or personal contact. (NACVE might serve as a resource for films, legislative bills, interpretation of Congressional action, etc.).

8) Develop and maintain a strong liaison with each state legislature and its committees.

9) Develop and maintain a strong liaison with each state's Congressional members and Congressional committees.

10) Develop a strong program of public meetings (utilizing regional areas of the state) to provide a forum for listening to the needs of people at the grass roots.

11) Approach industry and labor for assistance (both programmatic and financial) but be careful not to become involved in unrealistic motives.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Chairman: Richard A. Baker

Major points discussed:

1) Short overview of the Lindman study and its implications for the allocation of resources to local educational agencies.

2) Variable percentage formula which determines the excess cost of vocational programs to be reimbursed from state and/or federal funds based on taxable wealth of the district and assigned values. Merit if we could get anyone to agree on the values to be assigned.

3) Philosophical viewpoint on the allocation of resources:

   a) traditional operating vs. innovative programs

   b) mimimum program level vs. and/or discretionary funding

   c) operating vs. supplemental

4) Allocation of resources under the four criteria included in the 1968 Amendments (manpower, vocational needs, ability to provide resources and relative cost).

   a) Adequate criteria but question whether they should or can be used successfully as combined elements in a formula.

   b) Allocation based on need (FTE), (ADA), ability to provide resources and cost differential subject to state approval based on employment opportunities and/or socio-economic conditions.

5) Allocation of resources based on program cost differential.

   a) Allocation of teacher salaries based on contact hours

(shortcomings due to variation), student load, block time instruction and months of annual employment.

b) Allocation of monies based on student contact hours (derived from calculation of cost variables).

Summary conclusions:

1) Formula allocation of resources mandates a uniform pupil and cost accounting system for school districts (variable percentage formula if agreement can be reached on assigned values).

2) There is a need for a sound allocation procedure which takes into account student needs, ability and willingness of district to pay (reasonable tax effort), program cost considerations supported by manpower information.

PRESENTATIONS

Remarks by
GOVERNOR JAMES A. RHODES
Before the Joint Meeting of State and National Advisory Councils

Sometimes I feel a great deal like a lady of the southern hills of Ohio who used to write me letters. On several different occasions she proposed that I use my office in an attempt to collect some back alimony owed to her. I had written her on five or six different occasions and told her that we have no jurisdiction over the local courts. After the sixth or seventh letter she became very poetic. She had the hand of a Tennyson and the mind of a Pope and she wrote this:

> There ain't no justice in this land.
> Just got a divorce from my old man.
> Had to laugh at the judge's decision,
> Gave him six kids and they ain't his'n.

So it is in vocational education. The problem's never any one group's or one individual's or one organization's. It's always "his'n."

It was John Donne who said "send not to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee." And then he went on to say that no man is an island unto himself. I believe that is true of man. But not of the instrument attempting to educate and find jobs for the young people of America. Vocational education is isolated. It's an island. It's something that people in the other areas of endeavor will not touch.

More and more money is going into higher education and people in higher education will stand up and say many glowing things about vocational education. But they will not support it. You can't get a technical school located on a college campus.

You can't get a vocational school located on a college campus. Also they refuse to educate vocational teachers. But we have an oversupply of hundreds of thousands of academic teachers. They say that this is the result of ten years of overemphasizing in the graduate schools. In that same ten years, when so much money was going into graduate schools, we had fifteen million young Americans turned out in the streets, unskilled, untrained and unemployable. Where are these people today?

Well, we're assembled here today to help the American youth. And I want to say that we have on too many different occasions treated the symptoms instead of the disease. The federal programs have failed. They have played catchup education for the past twenty years. For over thirty years we've had a welfare system, the most dastardly piece of legislation ever thrown upon man. For over thirty years we have been giving handouts and dope instead of job training and job education. Every person on welfare in America today is a victim of the system. And every unemployed girl and boy in America is a victim of the present educational system.

The present educational system is antiquated and obsolete. Ninety-eight percent of the jobs we know today are new, since World War II. The curriculum is 1900. And I want to say also that in the field of higher education it is now harder for a college graduate to get a job than for a technical school graduate. Technical school graduates range from ninety-eight to ninety-nine percent employment.

I do not believe that anyone in the field of higher education is completely against the program of vocational education. But when it comes to the distribution of funds, those employed in higher education must be for higher education to protect themsleves and their property. We have no objection. But we cannot compromise with those who want to destroy us.

Now we've brought up some very provocative questions. I want to assure you that I have one goal: that is to see that every boy and every girl in America has an equal opportunity in education. And no one can stand up today in the halls of Congress or any legislature and say that we have equality in education. There should be two doors from every high school: one to college and one to a job. Only thirty-five percent of the high

school graduates go on to college. Where are all the bleeding hearts for the other sixty-five percent? And this system which has produced fifteen million unemployable young people in the past ten years has also created more drug abuse and more crime among young people than ever before in the history of America. We do not have ghettoes in America; we have areas of high rate unemployment with low grade education. Yet at this very hour they're still building high schools in the slums and low income areas of America. And we wonder why the young people are turned off the educational system. It is not meaningful. People condemn the "drop-outs." We don't have drop-outs. We have squeeze-outs, pitch-outs, throw-outs because at the age of sixteen these students did not believe that the present educational system is meaningful.

We have been attempting to do something in this area for sixteen years. The federal government has been giving out money to try to teach vocational education and never looks at the end result. Every time the federal government has had one failure they've invented two more programs to take care of the first one. Almost a total failure. And there's no place in the educational system at this very hour for a young man who wants to drop out of school and get a job because the criteria and standards are so rigid.

The students are tired of being examined by psychiatrists and welfare workers. They want training. They want a skill. They want a job. Only sixteen out of a hundred students entering first grade ever graduate from college. In the next hundred years it may be thirty-two. And yet there's no one who has a program for those that want to drop out.

One administrative change at the federal level could help this situation. I think there should be a separate federal board made up of labor, management and vocational educators to manage all federal vocational education programs.

The only reason that we have vocational education today is that the public wants it. It's not being given to you because of any other force except the public. Let me assure you that in the next five years the demand and command for vocational and job education and skills is going to be greater than any other thrust in the history of America. I think there should be a sep-

arate board to see to it that every boy and every girl can get an equal opportunity.

Another proposal we're going to study is the Fourteenth Amendment: "every boy and every girl in America is entitled to an equal education." I'll use my state as an example. Some of our school districts, God bless 'em, take state and federal money and have good vocational education. Some of our other areas are still building college-oriented high schools and do not offer vocational education. One of these days some taxpayer in a district without vocational education may file suit against the state in a federal court for an interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment on the issue of equal education opportunity. And they're going to win it. And then we better have all the heart specialists there because there are going to be some coronaries. I just cannot understand how people can slight young people.

Another proposal that we've been thinking about would put someone from the employment service within the confines of every vocational school in America. They should be in there helping the American youth to get a job. We have almost one million unemployable students every year turned out into the streets of America.

There are many, many issues, and I want to tell you what I've seen after twenty-five years of public life. I can see over the horizon. The number one problem in America is the number one issue and the number one problem is welfare. We're spending more money on welfare than on anything else. Why? Because somewhere thirty or forty years ago they did not believe in vocational education. I'll make a prediction: if the Fourteenth Amendment is applied to vocational education and we set up a separate federal board to give every boy and girl, regardless of race, color, creed or whatever an equal education, we can break the welfare cycle. We can't play catch-up education with people who have been on welfare for three or four generations. We can take those fourteen, fifteen and sixteen year old boys and girls and show them a different side of life. Show them that they do not have to remain on welfare if they've got an equal opportunity for a job. We're so proficient in education that we have more people mastering Latin, Greek, French and Spanish on welfare than any other nation in the world. I hope

that we can break the welfare cycle and I hope that we can make some progress. We're not going to make progress by discussing a small part of the overall picture. The picture is fifteen million boys and girls now, and—unless we change—in the next ten years we're going up to twenty million. And you talk about crime in the streets and you talk about no security for your home and your family. This is going to double or maybe even triple.

The salvation of young people is in this room. But I know that the minute you start discussing something provocative or controversial, something for progress for young people, there'll be trouble. But let's do something for the kids.

I know that some of you will smile and say that the Governor does not know what he's talking about. As Governor I had something to do with trying to suppress crime and the use of drugs among young people. And as I look out over this group, I have no objection if anybody disagrees with me but I want someone to give me an alternative to providing jobs in America. If we could get those who graduated from vocational education programs out to talk to the audience of adults, I assure you that a solution to the problem would come about much faster. The adults are toying with it.

The education system we know is a hundred years old. The general course is treadmill education—get 'em in and get 'em out and get the money. I think there's a great future for vocational education.

I want to close by talking about what we're up against. It's David up against Goliath. We're up against people who want to destroy us. This is the struggle. It's rough and tumble and I love it because we're going to win. We're going to win in spite of the people in education. We're a great deal like David the shepherd boy who walked down the valley of Elah looking for two older brothers and the army of Saul. And there was this great giant of Gath, the great warrior of the Philistines standing there with a pointed finger, issuing a challenge individually and collectively to every man in the army of Saul. And it was only David the shepherd boy who stepped up and accepted the challenge. When he did, Goliath looked down and said: "We have heard these words. I'll throw your flesh to the beasts of the fields. I'll throw your flesh to the fowl of the air." And

just then Eliab, David's elder brother, came forward and tapped him on the shoulder and said, "David, how come you've come to battle this great giant?" David said, "Have we not a cause?"

Here in this room we have a cause and we have a principle and we have a purpose. That is to see that every boy and every girl in America has an equal opportunity for a job and self-sufficiency and to join the productive sector of our society.

Remarks by
Dr. ERICK LINDMAN
Before the Joint Meeting of
State and National Advisory
Councils

There are three things needed to finance a public program that I've learned about over many years of working in this field. First you need an outstanding public figure who can be a spokesman for his cause, and second, you need a very alert citizenry and organizations that can maintain continuous contact with your Congressmen. I believe that the general area of vocational education has those. The third thing you need is a financial arrangement that has a sound and clear rationale to it. And this is the part that I think needs improvement.

Let's consider first the federal level. In order to render support in Congress for funds for vocational education over the years, it seems to me that we need to have a clear statement of the purpose of the requested appropriation and the amount it would cost to achieve that purpose. We cannot simply ask for money in terms of a vague idea of stimulation of vocational education, because the amount requested is not very easy to obtain if you go at it that way. So in our studies we tried to consider what the federal purpose was in providing money for education and how that purpose could contribute to the determination of the amount of funds considered by the federal government. Well, we came up with a suggestion—one of many possible—for the federal role. I'm not sure that the role that we have envisioned for the federal government so far leads to a definite amount of money, and I'm sure that this group is in a better position to decide what these goals ought to be than I am. But the point is, you need a clear idea of a role leading to a process. So we came up with something like this: supposing we set a national goal to see to it that one half of all the graduates of the public schools of this nation have one full year of vocational education, which

could be full-time for a year, half-time for two years, or quarter-time for four years. I think that at the present time about one-third of the high school graduates receive the equivalent of one year of vocational education. Having set our goal, we then must consider the cost of implementing it. In reviewing numerous studies, we found that vocational education classes tend to cost somewhere between fifty and eighty percent more than general education classes, with the average around seventy-five percent. Given the range and average percent of excess cost, you can calculate rather precisely how much excess cost the public school system of this nation would have to provide for the goal. We have in our report a formula for calculating that amount and it turns out that for those figures the excess cost of vocational education would be about three percent of public and elementary and secondary education costs each year. Now, the total cost of public elementary and secondary education each year is around $40 billion. Three percent of that is something like $1.2 billion. That's the amount the schools would spend above what they would spend if they simply provided general education for all students. Now then, is that the role of the federal government—to make available from federal sources the extra costs that schools will incur to provide this amount of vocational education? Maybe that's too much. Maybe the cost estimate of seventy-five percent is too high. Or maybe the government will say, "Well, we should only provide half the excess cost from federal sources and the rest of it ought to be provided locally or by the states. But what I'm getting at is some kind of a goal and some kind of a purpose so that you can arrive at a dollar figure by these straightforward calculations. I think that if you can do that, you have a much better opportunity to be heard in Congress. Well, that's one of the things we had in our report, then, was the suggestion for converting from a goal or a purpose on the one hand to a dollar requirement on the other.

Now, we also looked into the problem of allocation among those figures. That, of course, presents some difficult problems. The fundamental dilemma is this: If you try to reward the states for their accomplishments, you tend to give the money to the states that have the better programs and are doing a better job and for the most part have more funds and resources. If you try

to help the states that have the greatest need, you give less money to the states that have done the best job. Invariably, when Congress looks at this they say you ought to reward excellence and achievement and therefore we ought to set up a system which gives the money to the states that are doing the best job. Others, of course, say you should grant the most funds where need is greatest.

Now another thing we looked at is the question of the administration within the states. I think we face some new problems because of the difficulty of maintaining something called equality and at the same time avoiding sameness. This is obviously applicable to vocational education. We can't have every school offering the same vocational program or your whole manpower planning activity goes down the drain. So we have to try to develop a system that will take care of that. The suggestion that we made in our report was that we first calculate the total cost requirement of each school system for vocational education and then from that deduct the amount of foundation program funds or general support they receive for the children in that program. We call that the residual cost, which differs from the excess cost. Residual cost is what's left over after you deduct the amount the state provides for all programs from the cost of vocational education programs. Hopefully the state that provides the amount needed for this residual cost has some sort of a categorized program involving the use of federal funds.

Well, I promised this morning not to prolong this. If any of you want to pursue these ideas in greater detail there will be an opportunity to do it at the 1:30 session this afternoon. Thank you very much.

Remarks by
MR. DANIEL H. WOODS
Before the Joint Meeting of
State and National Advisory
Councils

I was most flattered when Dr. Dellefield asked that I speak on what we as State Advisory Councils can do as far as industry-education cooperation is concerned.

I would like for you to know that I am a life-long resident of Arkansas with all my formal education in this state. For the last twenty years, I have been deeply involved in education, including pre-school, public schools, vocational-tech schools at both the secondary and post-secondary levels, and in manpower programs. And from my association with our Timex plants in urban locations and with other Council members throughout the country, I conclude that even though my remarks are going to be made mostly on the basis of my experience here in Arkansas, our problems are very little different from those in the other states.

Now while I will certainly address myself to the topic of industry-education cooperation, I would like to go one step further and discuss briefly just what, from my experience over the past four years, I see as the role of advisory councils.

We all know that a council is a body of people of various numbers. When we call that body an "advisory" body, then we have a group whose function is to provide advice as opposed to creating policy. Thus it is all too easy for us to fall into the trap of limiting ourselves to a small and relatively passive portion of the entire picture—that of evaluation and advice. I submit to you that we, as State Advisory Council members, have one primary role and that is the role of vigorous activity; that we have but one function: to adequately represent the needs of all our citizens; and that we have but one concern and that concern is people. I feel that we can be of greatest benefit to the

people by actively promoting a broadly based education system that will ultimately serve the needs of all people in all walks of life.

For social progress to occur in any area, mankind must maximize the talents of those concerned and affected. For this reason, a high degree of specialization has evolved in such disciplines as medicine, education, science and research. This is as it should be, with perhaps, one exception. We're becoming more cognizant that whatever our expertise is in any given area, it is still essential to see and determine how our specific efforts fit into the big picture. Thus, if we as State Councils involve ourselves in the big picture and work for change resulting in an improved educational system for all our people, then we, and I as an industrialist, will not have to worry about this matter of industry-education cooperation. For a system that meets the needs of all the people will also best serve the needs of industry.

In having the opportunity to serve as the first chairman of the Arkansas Advisory Council from 1969 to 1971, I talked to most of the other Councils around the country. I sensed that most of you have problems very similar to ours: namely the reluctance of the professional educators and the legislative bodies to recognize the changing needs of education today. Educators must be on guard against becoming set in their direction to the point of resisting any or all deviations from that direction. We have witnessed how the educational system may have expert educators who are skilled in their profession. But in so becoming experts they develop a myopia which divorces them from the needs and mainstream of our society. We all too often witness experts whose qualifications are beyond reproach, yet the system—as it is in Arkansas—permits an inexcusably large number of students to fail. In Arkansas, forty-five percent of those who enter the educational system fail and fail miserably. These are the drop-outs. Not educationally trained in any way to help themselves. Thus, a large number of them ultimately become our unemployed, our poverty population and a great expense to all of us. We in industry are affected immensely by the actions of the experts. We in industry—and yes, all of society—are on the receiving end of the educator's efforts and the educational process. I submit that a forty-five percent drop-out level is not the help we

need in industry. Timex, my company, operates four plants in Little Rock, employing over five thousand people. We are presently building a new plant right here in Hot Springs. The unemployment rate in Little Rock is now only 2.3% and most industry there, including my own, is looking for people. We have openings for two hundred additional employees. And yet there are hundreds of people on poverty roles, not really interested in working, mainly because our system has not prepared them to go into a field of work. In an area like Little Rock, there should be one hundred percent employment.

Because we as Councils and individual systems are on the receiving end of the educational processes, we must live with what we are given. For this reason, we were created by the U.S. Congress. We do not profess to be experts in teaching techniques and program planning, program finance or educational philosophy. We do profess and recognize many shortcomings in our educational system. Shortcomings which must be corrected.

What are some of the things that education could be doing to better serve the total needs of our society? The first step would be to move away from this myopia which seems to affect the system. No matter where you are or what state you represent, we always encounter the same set of problems. Some of you are saying that there's too much effort at the post-secondary level. Others say we have good secondary systems but that the post-secondary level has been neglected. Still others are saying we are overweighed with community colleges.

Given the payments we taxpayers make annually for education, cannot we expect and demand a system which meets everyone's needs? In my opinion, we have the right to expect a broadly-based educational system. This right is precisely why many State Advisory Councils have created varying degrees of controversy. For as educational experts develop within the various disciplines, at the same time they develop their own disciples. Some of them, instead of being flexible and changing as the needs of people change, create a rigid system, held in on whatever course it happens to be on.

In Arkansas, this is towards building more and more vo-tech schools at the post-secondary level. Though the Arkansas

Council commends the programs offered in these area schools, it recognizes that, in the first place, area schools are expensive to build and staff; secondly, they are not serving the needs of people in highly populated and highly industrialized areas; third, they reap a ridiculously low percentage of those needing vocational education; and fourth, the cost per full time student is often ten times the cost of vocational education at secondary schools. And yet I'm sad to say ten more area schools are on the drawing boards with money for their funding appropriated by the General Assembly, while our State Education Department has not even scratched the surface of our needs at the secondary level or the broad-based community college level.

Let's not create a misimpression. Let me say that we have had our successes as well as our problems. We're very fortunate to have a legislature which has addressed itself to the problems at the secondary level. During the present General Assembly, the Advisory Council drafted legislation, copies of which some of you have picked up, which should provide a tremendous boost to secondary vo-tech programs in the state. One of our Council members introduced the bill and worked diligently for its passage and I'm pleased to announce that, thanks to this Council, the farsighted members of the General Assembly and countless people in all the councils, the budget for secondary vocational education programs in Arkansas will experience a 233% increase in the current year. The increase itself will be heartening, but the General Assembly went one step further and stated—and I quote from the bill:

> It is the intent of this Act to provide opportunities for expanding programs of vocational education in secondary schools of the public schools of this state in order that no child shall leave the public schools ill-prepared for entrance into either college or a post-secondary technical institute, or a vocational-technical work opportunity.

Progress is being made. To have progress you must have change. And to have change you must have action. This progress would not have occurred without a dedicated and hard-working Advisory Council. Let me assure you, ladies and gentlemen, it's quite

rewarding and exciting to be in on this action.

At the risk of sounding repetitious, we must have a broadly based system in this country. I agree with many that it must be a career education system. It must first begin in the elementary system where the students are taught that working is really no shame. It continues in the secondary system where the students should have a multitude of options available to them in order to meet their varied needs. It continues to serve the adults in the community as long as they want to learn new skills or upgrade old ones.

With tongue in cheek, about the only place where I part company with proponents of career education in Washington is when it comes to how much money it needs. As an industrialist, I can assure you that very few of the young people coming out of even our most sophisticated high schools are highly trained technicians. But at least they are people who possess basic abilities in several areas. If they are lucky enough to attend a school with good vocational orientation and varied vocational courses, they are well ahead when they enter the labor market. And here I might point out that, though you may find this hard to believe, our company, which manufactures and assembles for Timex Watch in our Little Rock and Hot Springs plants, has had more engineers who are not graduates than who are graduates. And I will put our engineers up against the engineers of any company represented in this room.

Let's face facts. Governor Rhodes said this morning that thirty-five percent of our high school graduates enter college. But he didn't say how many of those who enter graduate from college. Our statistics in Arkansas indicate that only fifteen percent of our students become college graduates. And most students will never see the inside of a classroom after high school. So the secondary level is our last chance to reach them. Yet our main efforts are still directed at the college-bound. It is clear that we must channel more effort into preparation of our students for holding down a skilled job.

I happen to be a college graduate myself, and probably most of you are. My oldest daughter is in the process of studying a pre-med course. So I obviously am not criticizing the academic disciplines. But I have a second daughter in upper high school

grades who is highly talented in art and music. And though her grades are good, her inclinations are not toward the academic disciplines at this time. And—who knows?—my seven-year-old may be one of the forty-five percent that drop out. So as Council members and as citizens we must look at the growing needs of those who will never attend college or who will never attend an advanced trade school or vo-tech school, or for that matter, who will never attend any educational school after the secondary level. We, as Council members, must look to the severe problems caused when our system drives away—I'm using words similar to those Governor Rhodes used—drives away forty-five percent of our students from even completing high school. We must give the electronics technician of tomorrow the same opportunity that we give our future physicians."

The second step should be to get away from the personal dynasty-building syndrome we see in our adult educational programs, both at the state and federal levels. I am serving on the OIC Board, the Advisory and Manpower Board, and several others. I recognize the value of each one of these programs and I'm not leveling charges against any one program. But nonetheless, at the post-secondary manpower level, we have some of our worst problems. It is sheer absurdity to have one program, complete with an army of administrators serving a limited number of courses and people, while at the same time, in Little Rock and scattered all over the state, the high schools, the area vo-tech schools, the community colleges, the Land programs, NDCA programs, the OIC, New York City Job Program and numerous others are all involved in similar things for the same population. If one conducted a survey to find the strongest and most vocal advocate for this multiplicity of programs, it would probably be the administrators of these programs. It's ridiculous to have so many programs operating independently of each other with overlapping jurisdictions to the point that they often use the taxpayers' money to compete for the same students. I ask you, why can we not have instead one institution with one administrative staff which meets the total education needs of the adult community? Why not one unit where one can go and attain adult basic education or the philosophy of Socrates? Where one can go and obtain rudimentary skills in all the mechanics or highly

specialized automotive technical skills? Why, I ask you, can we not ask for and receive an adult educational system which is circular, encompassing our total society, a system where one may move in and out at his own pace for whatever his needs may be? Why not a system with flexibility to change from month to month and with the courage to eliminate programs that are no longer needed?

In closing, I submit we can ask for and demand this type of system. This is the type of system that industry needs so badly. And, like I said, you can count on industry cooperation. We hope we can have the cooperation of education. A broadly based system, which is designed to meet the total needs of the total population will best serve that population and at the same time will best serve the needs of industry.

So first, let's make the most of education while we have our children in school. Second, let's develop a broadly based education system with flexibility to serve all of our population. Third, let's have the courage to change when change is needed. And fourth, let's be completely people-oriented. For that, my fellow Advisory Council members, is the name of the game. People. We are in the people business. It takes interest, it takes dedication, it takes broad vision, but most of all it takes active participation by all of us to succeed in this people business.

Thank you very much.

Remarks by
CONGRESSMAN LLOYD MEEDS
Before the Joint Meeting of State and National Advisory Councils

It occurred to me while studying President Nixon's Education Revenue Sharing Plan that my talk this afternoon would be a truly unique experience. As you know, the plan includes repeal of the 1963 Vocational Act...and abolishment of your Advisory Councils. This must be the first time I've spoken before a species so near extinction.

But many people also regard Congress as obsolete and deserving of extinction. Especially people in the White House. So the thrust of my message to you today is "perfectly clear": as a member of a supposedly obsolete species to members of a nearly-extinct species, I believe reports of our demise are greatly exaggerated.

Congress is strongly resisting whatever plans for obsolescence its detractors may nurture. And I don't expect too many of you wish your Advisory Council to self-destruct. Education revenue sharing is a proposal far more important than any inconvenience to our own membership in a Congress or a council. HEW Secretary Weinberger received a cool reception when he explained education revenue sharing to the general education subcommittee three weeks ago. But that does not mean the proposal is dead. Far from it.

Educators entranced by the prospect of stringless federal aid should be required to study the history of general revenue sharing. Governors and mayors were thrilled at the prospect of no-strings general revenue sharing. But when they started adding up their budgets the sum turned out to be less than its parts. The total of general revenue sharing was much less than the previous special programs...and they were left with only the promise of another revenue sharing program sometime down the road.

As a friend of vocational education, I think education revenue sharing is a clear and present danger to all we have been trying to build for young people in this country. After long years in the social and financial basement of American education, vocational education has just lately begun to put it together. This conference itself demonstrates how the National and State Advisory Councils are working together to get vocational education to where it is most needed.

The Third Annual Report of the Washington State Advisory Council, which I looked at on the way down, does one of the clearest jobs of pinpointing occupational openings I have seen. Your efforts have turned the field around from an agrarian outlook no longer valid in many areas. The curriculum has been modernized and we have a new breed of vocational educators rising in the ranks.

Federal spending for vocational education was about $40 million in Fiscal 1972. Federal aid is certainly not the only factor, since it amounts to only one-sixth of total spending on vocational education. But it is an indication of acceptance...one that has been long in coming. Now the Administration has decided federal guidelines and the influence of Advisory Councils constitutes undue "categorization."

But categorization would be continued under education revenue sharing. We are being asked to trade new labels for old. Thirty percent of the new "vocational education" category can be diverted by the states into anything the state feels like... except impact aid. You and I know what that means, since we've been around on these funding battles before.

For all the progress in recent years, vocational education does not yet have the political punch to compete against general education for funds. It is now respectable in some circles to speak of students who do not go on to college. But when it comes time to divide up what funds are available, they still go to advanced math and college preparation courses. Job training is at the long end of the line. I maintain vocational education funds must be categorized until the reform of the 1963 Vocational Education Act and the 1968 Amendments have borne fruit and we have a strong cadre of vocational education administrators making their imprint on educational policy across the nation.

In addition to the thirty percent of vocational education that can—and will be—diverted if this bill becomes law, the states can divert any additional amount if the Secretary of HEW finds it would "more effectively achieve the purposes" of the Revenue Sharing Act. I'm not saying that state education officials would automatically scuttle vocational education. But it is inconceivable to me that, given the pressures put upon them by various education forces in their states, that they will be able to get by without diverting funds from vocational education and into areas more popular academically.

It may be useful at this point to quote an obsolete political figure. I refer, of course, to the "old" Nixon. In Portland, Oregon, on May 15, 1968, Mr. Nixon said: "I believe we should get a goal for ourselves, that every youngster entering public high school shall have the opportunity to learn at least one marketable skill by the time he graduates. For too many young men, the end of education has meant the beginning of unemployment."

In this instance I wish the "new" Nixon would heed the "old" Nixon.

As you know, President Nixon's Fiscal 1974 budget requests no funds for National and State Advisory Councils for Vocational education.

As the vocational educator is sometimes the only link between the child and the real world of earning a living, so the Advisory Council is the vocational educator's best window on the world outside the classroom. This key link transcends his specialty and relates his work to occupational demands and employment trends.

Failure to fund Advisory Councils will cost vocational education the influence of those who have been most instrumental in bringing about both widened input and needed change. It is dangerously myopic to abolish Advisory Councils to—as the proponents of revenue sharing say—"return decision-making to the local level." Their proposal would abolish our working system of local input in favor of no input at all. I fear abolition of Advisory Councils could mean the end of relevance and job performance in vocational education that is assured by their existence.

What does "local decision-making" really mean in education

revenue sharing? It means a return to the same process by which vocational education decisions were made prior to 1963. That's where the decision was made to put seventeen percent of Illinois vocational education funds into Chicago when it had fifty percent of the children. That's where the decisions were made that limited vocational education to second-class citizenship in the first place. That's where vocational education always came out second best to academic subjects because education was dominated by the academicians—and still is. Under revenue sharing we can return to those less-than-glorious days of yesteryear—before 1963, when vocational education was the poor cousin of American education.

Perhaps it's not such a bad idea to keep nominal control of federal funds at the federal level where some unpopular decisions can be made. Decisions about comprehensive high schools and area vocational schools, about cooperative education and work-study.

In the final analysis, local decisions pretty much control the expenditures of federal dollars today. We in Congress set out broad objectives to be achieved with those federal dollars and you people, working with local educators, establish the methodology. It is a system that seems to be working for the betterment of vocational education and I see no reason to abolish it now.

As you also know, no funds are requested to fund the new Occupational Education Act, which was part of last year's Higher Education Amendments.

And the Nixon Administration has rescinded its fund request for the Office of Education's "Career Education" experiments. The concept of "career education" is an attractive one. Cancellation of research funds is a serious mistake, whatever the shortcomings of OE's experiments.

Career education, is, after all, the direction in which we're moving. Vocational-technical education must eventually become a full partner in our school system. The concept of a dual system must be eliminated. Preparing people with marketable skills is just one function but it must be a function which is integrated into the total system rather than standing in the corner wearing a dunce cap. To realize this objective will require the development of curricula combining vocational and academic

concepts. Clusters, or education families, must be developed and implemented which will respond to the challenges of an age in which a person may be called upon to utilize four or five skills during a lifetime of work.

But there is another difficult challenge which must be met if the grand design is to be accomplished. We have to find some way of convincing people of the real importance of vocational-technical education in the total scheme of things.

The problem of inadequate funding, the problem of limited facilities and teaching staff all depend, in large measure, for a solution on a public that knows the potential of vocational-technical education. That public can then take a hand in insuring school board policy and state and local funding at levels truly proportionate with its importance and needs.

This will take a selling job. I'm not telling you anything new. But it's not going to be an easy sell. I talk a lot about vocational-technical education. I talk to educators, parents, businessmen, industrialists and government officials. To a person, they all agree about its importance, but somehow the increased impetus is not forthcoming to make the changes that are necessary if we are to pay more than lip service to this concept.

Perhaps I am too impatient—changes are taking place—but not fast enough to suit me. In analyzing what might be done to speed up the necessary metamorphosis, I have come to some conclusions. Allow me to make two suggestions. Neither is a cure-all, but hopefully they could help.

One: Vocational-technical education has a great success story to tell. It should be told more forcefully. In-depth studies have shown that:

1) Vocational education graduates have more job security and earn more money than academic graduates who do not go on to college.

2) Vocational graduates have larger accumulated earnings over an eleven-year period than do academic graduates who do not go on to college.

3) A majority of vocational graduates get a job within six weeks of graduation.

4) There is no difference in leisure time activities and affilia-

tion with organizations of vocational education graduates.

Nothing succeeds like success—if people are aware of that success. It is our task to see that the public learns about the contributions of vocational-technical education.

The second suggestion is less concrete and much harder to implement. It involves not only altering attitudes toward vocational education but changing a whole trend of thinking, of status, of social judgments that are overtaking our nation.

There was a time when working with your hands had a dignity. The village blacksmith was a man of some prestige. The farmer's work was considered "honest" in the very broadest sense of the word.

With the coming of mechanization, the prestige of craftsmanship began to erode. And soon we saw the transfer of allegiance and status to those professions that required almost exclusively mental skills. Now this attitude is solidifying into a snobbery that pervades our society. Even the man who works with his hands hesitates to think his son might do the same.

This subtle attitude can be one of the most corrosive to beset our society, because it leads, as directly as the wagon follows the horse, into a stratification of society, a caste system.

Further, the idea is prevalent that when you work with your hands you don't use your mind. I don't need to lecture this group on the fallacy in that.

But I think the public has to be reminded of the specialized knowledge, training, and abilities needed in the craft fields.

What possible justification is there for a doctor or lawyer or teacher to feel smug when a layman asks what appears to be a stupid question about his field? But then be completely unconcerned that he doesn't even know the basics of the internal combustion engine?

I sometimes think an auto mechanic does a great public service when he stares in ill-disguised disgust at a customer who admits that he doesn't know where the carburetor is on his car. Perhaps there is a therapeutic value to the prices we pay plumbers, electricians and TV repairmen when they perform a job of which we, as so-called "professional" people, are incapable.

A large part of the problem of low public interest in vocational

education is directly traceable, I believe, to this distortion of values. It is not that people think badly of vocational education as such. Rather it is that many feel vocational education is for the other guy's children. It even reaches the point where people feel that vocational education is what you do after you've failed—failed to become a doctor, a scientist or an IBM systems engineer.

One of the great tragedies with this view is that so many young people whose talents would make them good mechanics, master carpenters, excellent cooks or draftsmen, are diverted into other areas, areas for which they have less talent, simply because their parents and our education system feels it is better.

I think there is something out of balance in a society that admires a mediocre scientist and shrugs off a first-rate technician.

What can we do?

Somehow, I think we must recapture President Kennedy's concept of striving for excellence, and that it must include all human activity. We should have deep respect for any job well done. We should strive to encourage our children to do what they like to do, have talent for and which they can do well.

If by that criteria a young person becomes a brain surgeon—fine.

If by that criteria a person becomes a machinist—fine.

But we must stop classifying jobs and begin making qualitative judgments about work.

John Gardner put it about as succinctly as anyone I know when he said, "an excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exhalted activity, will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.

GSA DC 74-3968